

On November 19-20, 2002, at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina, the Functional Support Cost Peer Review Team Kickoff Meeting was held. In attendance were the following Team members:

- 1) David G. Keller – Savannah River Site – Peer Review Team Lead
- 2) Cindy W. Doyle – Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
- 3) Armando R. Bautista – Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

The demands of work kept the other two Team members from attending the meeting.

At the meeting, the following items were discussed:

- 1) In the Peer Review of Strategic Petroleum Reserve in 2002, it had been difficult to make contact with the proper individual to schedule the Review. The Team had to go through DOE to secure the contact name.
- 2) New sites or sites being reviewed the first time express anxiety about the Review. The think is it is an audit, not just a review.
- 3) Sites being reviewed continue to ask what the Functional Support Cost (FSC) Report is being used for and who uses it. **Gregg come up with an answer.**
- 4) Question was raised, “Can we put in the DOE-HQ Annual FSC Report which sites had been reviewed and when?” The answer will be researched. **David request from Brian.**
- 5) Question was raised, “Can Peer Review Team members get a copy of the DOE FSC Report annually?” The answer will be researched. **Cindy request of Richard Heller @ DOE-HQ**
- 6) Team consensus was that there should not be a requirement for recasting if one Support category needed to be moved to another Support category. The cost would remain Support regardless. If it were involving Mission Direct V.S. Support, then the level of impact would have to be determined before requiring recasting.
- 7) Team consensus was that whichever site incurs cost should report that cost. This involves Work for Others.
- 8) Question was raised, “Is there more weight paid to any single FSC category over the others?” This would affect materiality regarding recasting. **David request answer from Richard Heller @DOE-HQ.**
- 9) Team consensus was that the Review Team would not” volunteer” the method used to calculate the level of accuracy of a site’s report.
- 10) A contact listing of names, phone numbers, etc., of Team members would be created and made available to the Team. **David - DONE**
- 11) It was suggested that the Team secure permission to use FMSIC letterhead for the Report and other correspondence to the sites. This would indicate a continuity of performing Peer Reviews (by one “company”) and the support of FMSIC. **David – Already requested of Brian – awaiting response**
- 12) There is a need to clarify the method used to state the accuracy of a reviewed site’s FSCR. This method should be in writing and provided to all Team members. **Armando, write up a statement of the formula and reasoning behind it.**

- 13) The Team consensus was that permission should be sought for the Team's Mission Statement to be put on the FMSIC web page. **David will request of Brian.**
- 14) The team requested that the history of the FSC Peer Reviews be updated to indicate those sites to be reviewed in FY03. **David - DONE**
- 15) Team consensus was that concentration should be placed on the category "Taxes" this year during Peer Reviews.
- 16) Team consensus was that a Review Team should have the Site Profile of the site being reviewed in advance. This would be a source of general information on the site.
- 17) Team consensus was that the month for the Kickoff Meeting should be selected after a polling of the Team members.
- 18) Team consensus was that face-to-face Kickoff Meetings were the most effective and productive and had advantages over telephone conference call meetings.
- 19) Team consensus was that the duty of arranging the Kickoff Meeting, selecting the site, etc., should be rotated among the members.
- 20) Team consensus was that the initial Peer Review of a site should be on-site and not by phone, even if the Review met the other criteria for a phone Review.
- 21) Team assigned members to the proposed schedule of Peer Reviews in FY2003. **DONE**
- 22) Seek permission to put in Peer Review Team Call Letter the statement from the DOE Call Letter that requested cooperation of the sites regarding Peer Reviews. **David will request of Richard Heller @DOE-HQ.**
- 23) Team is to advise Team Leader if there are problems with sites in agreeing to scheduling Peer Reviews.
- 24) Team consensus was that assigned Peer Reviews would be completed before September 30 of any given year.
- 25) Team members will advise Team Leader of sites' contact names, phone numbers, addresses, etc. that they learn during Peer Reviews.